

Appl. No. 10/652,325
Atty. Docket No. 9350
Amdt. dated June 6, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed March 8, 2007
Customer No. 27752

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUN 06 2007

REMARKS

No amendments to the instant claims are presented by way of the current response. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 8 remain in the instant Application and are presented for the Examiner's reconsideration in light of the following comments.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 3, and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over McNeil, U.S. Patent No. 4,919,351 in view of Nystrand, et al., U.S. Pat. No. Re 28,353. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In the attached Declaration provided under 37 C.F.R. §1.132, the Declarant Kevin Benson McNeil declares that, "A key aspect of [the McNeil] invention is that both sets of blades remain parallel during engagement and also remain at matched circumferential speeds while in mesh." Mr. McNeil goes on to state that, "An important point here is that the meshed blades of the '351 system remain at **matched circumferential velocities** while in mesh (engagement) even though the bedroll and chop-off roll they are affixed to may be driven at different angular velocities." (Emphasis in original)

Mr. McNeil goes on to state that, "Contrastingly, the claims of the instant application differ significantly in that the web stretching is achieved by relative circumferential velocities between meshing blades." Thus, it is Mr. McNeil's opinion that, "... the approach of the cited '351 reference and the claims of the instant application to achieve localized stretch in a sheet material are grossly dissimilar." Mr. McNeil concludes that the claims of the instant application are unobvious over the '351 reference cited by the Examiner, because "... **the blade pass frequencies of the bedroll blades and the chop-off roll blades of the instant application are distinct – those of the cited '351 reference are not.**" (Emphasis in original) Therefore, the disclosure of the *McNeil* reference does not render any of the instant claims obvious. Further, the '353 reference does nothing to remedy any of the defects with regard to the '351 reference.

Applicants respectfully believe Mr. McNeil's Declaration speaks for itself. Therefore, the reference cited by the Examiner fails to teach, disclose, or even remotely

Appl. No. 10/652,325
Atty. Docket No. 9350
Amdt. dated June 6, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed March 8, 2007
Customer No. 27752

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

JUN 06 2007

suggest each and every element of Applicants' claimed invention. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection with respect to Claims 1, 3, and 5 over the cited reference.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that each of Applicants' remaining claims is in condition for allowance and favorable reconsideration is requested.

This response is timely filed pursuant to the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.8 and M.P.E.P. §512, and no fee is believed due. However, if any additional charges are due, the Examiner is hereby authorized to deduct such charge from Deposit Account No. 16-2480 in the name of The Procter & Gamble Company.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By: 

Peter D. Meyer
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 47,792
(513) 634-7419

June 6, 2007

Customer No. 27752